

April 4, 1975

state bureaucracy which is not necessarily bad if it has a reason for functioning. In this case, I don't think it does. What you are doing is putting the State Department of Health into an area that really ought to be a matter of local control. They have responsibilities for checking on sanitation, that's true but this bill gives them substantially wider powers and what, first of all, is a mobile home park? It is an area that has a place for two or more mobile homes. So this is a very broad coverage in itself and besides looking at sanitation, they are also required to take a look at mobile home lot facilities. This would be like buildings for washers and dryers, accessory buildings and structures, safety requirements and the ones that really disturb me, park design and land use. Now no doubt the State Department of Health could come up with good standards because there are national standards they could adopt rather easily. What I am concerned about is that we have sort of a mindless conformity to standards so that any sort of mobile home park with more than 20 homes has to have a building with utilities, services, washers and dryers provided to the occupants of the mobile home park. Furthermore, while the park design requirements they could levy upon the owner of a mobile home park would be aesthetically pleasing, such as, requirements for certain numbers of trees, for hard-surfacing of driveways. All of these things add to the costs of providing space to people who have mobile homes. This is a matter that ought to be decided locally by the city councils and by the county boards and not by the State Department of Health. They have a role for sanitation inspection but it certainly...this bill goes far beyond that legitimate role, therefore, I would ask that you would oppose this legislation and end the discussion on it.

CLERK: Mr. President, a motion on the desk. I move to indefinitely postpone LB 91. Signed Senator Mills.

PRESIDENT: The chair recognizes Senator Mills.

SENATOR MILLS: Mr. President and members of the body, I think we have heard the discussion. As Senator Bereuter so aptly described, I think on just his discussion alone would support the indefinitely postpone motion. I move that we adopt that motion.

PRESIDENT: Well, Senator Clark, your light was on when we were discussing the bill. Do you want to discuss the kill motion?

SENATOR CLARK: Mr. President and members, I would sure support the kill motion. It seems to me, I don't know who they would use for inspectors but they have 1100 parks that they would have to inspect and I don't know how long that would be or how long it would take but it does add to the cost of these people. I think you are regulating people again and I think people are completely over regulated. They don't want to be regulated any more. They are living there out of choice. We try to cure a problem here and all we do is create six more and I certainly don't want to do that. I just don't think people should be regulated this way and I certainly vote to indefinitely postpone.